

REMARKS

The Final Office Action mailed June 27, 2007 considered claims 1-36 and 41-43. Claims 1-36 and 41-43 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Carson et al. (US 2004/0093326) in view of Copperman et al. (U.S.. 6,711,585 B1) and in further view of Szabo (US 7,181,438 B1).¹

By this amendment claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11, 12, 14, 15, 17, 28, 32 and 33 have been amended.² Claims 2 and 41-43 have been cancelled. Accordingly, claims 1 and 3-36 are pending, of which claims 1, 17, 28 are the only independent claims at issue.

The present invention is generally directed to obtaining web service information for one or more related web services represented at different nodes in the taxonomy. For example, claim 1 defines receiving a request for web service information, the request including user entered identification data and relationship data, the user entered identification data identifying a specified web service represented at a specified node within the taxonomy, the specified web service having been specified by a computer user, and the user entered relationship data identifying at least a first and a second specified hierarchical relationship, wherein the relationship data indicates that any related web service having either the first or second specified hierarchical relationship with the specified web service is a related web service of interest to the user. Next, claim 1 defines extracting the identification data and the relationship data from the request.

Next, claim 1 defines querying one or more databases in a plurality of different taxonomies located on one or more different computer systems using the identification data and the relationship data to obtain web service information for any web services having at least one the first and the second specified hierarchical relationship with the specified web service, the web service information configured for presentation in a hierarchical format, the hierarchy being based on the specified web service's hierarchical relationship with other web services in the plurality of different taxonomies, the nodes of each database comprising at least one of a plurality of root nodes. Next, claim 1 defines receiving web service information that corresponds

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

² Support for the amendments to the claims are found throughout the specification and previously presented claims, including but not limited to paragraphs [0009], [0050], [0057] and Figures 3 & 5.

to any related web services having at least one of the first and the second specified hierarchical relationships with the specified web service in response to the query, the received web service information including the specified web service and at least one related web service being displayable in a navigable taxonomy. Lastly, claim 1 defines returning the received web service information to the client, the received web service information for graphical presentation at the client to show a user relevant portions of any of the plurality of taxonomies that included related web services having at least one of the first and the second specified hierarchical relationships with the specified web service.

Claims 17 is a method claim similar to claim 1, but from the perspective of a client. Claim 28 is a system claim similar to claim 1. Claim 41 is a system claim corresponding to claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the cited art of record does not anticipate or otherwise render the amended claims unpatentable for at least the reason that the cited art does not disclose, suggest, or enable each and every element of these claims.

Carson describes providing a taxonomy for mobile electronic services (MES's). *Carson* notes that, from a client's perspective, MES providers often appear and disappear at random intervals (for example, as a client is traveling in and out of wireless service cells). Thus, the availability of e-services can change frequently (par. [0009]). *Carson* describes a system for a taxonomy to describe MES's using a tree structure for organizing descriptive characteristics of the MES (par. [0010]). *Carson* further describes a method for searching MES's by searching each category of MES's (par. [0011]). *Carson's* described system can also classify MES's by assigning designators to each category of MES (par. [0012]).

Copperman teaches a method and system for organizing and retrieving information using taxonomies. For example, in a system where there are multiple documents, document text is searched and associated with a corresponding taxonomy, depending on how related the text is to the taxonomy (Abs.). *Copperman* uses initial taxonomy tags to indicate the broad concept for the search and interest taxonomy tags that specify how the results are to be ranked as determined by the strength of association between the concept and the document text (Col. 6:46-63). The more related the document text is to the concept represented by the initial taxonomy tag, the higher the document will rank in relation to that concept. *Szabo* is cited to show an editable hierarchical nodal map where elements are mapped based on the relationship between the content of the element and the class definition.

However, neither *Carson*, *Copperman*, nor *Szabo* teaches or suggests querying one or more databases in a plurality of different taxonomies located on one or more different computer systems using the identification data and the relationship data to obtain web service information for any web services having at least the first and the second specified hierarchical relationships with the specified web service, the web service information being presentable in hierarchical format, the hierarchy being based on the specified web service's hierarchical relationship with other web services in the plurality of different taxonomies, the nodes of each database comprising at least one of a plurality of root nodes, as recited in claim 1.

Furthermore, neither *Carson*, *Copperman*, nor *Szabo* teaches or suggests returning the received web service information to the client, the received web service information for graphical presentation at the client to show a user relevant portions of any of the plurality of taxonomies that included related web services having at least one of the first and the second specified hierarchical relationships with the specified web service, as recited in claim 1. At least for either of these reasons, claim 1 patentably defines over the art of record. At least for either of these reasons, claims 17 and 28 also patentably define over the art of record. Since each of the dependent claims depend from one of claims 1, 17 and 28, each of the dependent claims also patentably define over the art of record for at least either of the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at 801-533-9800.

Dated this 27th day of August, 2007.

Respectfully submitted,

/GREGORY R. LUNT/

RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
MICHAEL B. DODD
Registration No. 46,437
GREGORY R. LUNT
Registration No.: 57,354
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 47973

RDN:MBD:crb
DS0000007913V001